

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1 – 34 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 27 have been amended. Claims 34 – 75 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly point out what the Applicant regards as the invention. Support for the amendments and additions is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 23, 25-29 and 31-34 under 35 USC 102(e) as being unpatentable over Mehta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0131404 A1) in view of Little et al. (U.S. Patent No. US 2002/0055852). The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 6, 13, 17, 24 and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Mehta in view of Little and further in view of Larsson (US 6,304,757 B1). The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 22 and 35 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Mehta in view of Little and further in view of Thornton (US 6,751,454 B2). The Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or render obvious all of the elements of the Applicant's claimed invention. In particular, the cited references fail to teach the element in independent claim 1 as amended of "selecting, based upon a service dialed number selected to address the call, a response to the call." In contrast, Mehta teaches supplying applications to a subscriber of a cell phone service provider based on subscriber profiles stored by Administrator 509 if it is determined that the subscriber is authorized to download the requested applications (paragraph 138 of Mehta). Mehta fails to teach using a service dialed number selected to address the call to select a response to the call and instead relies on stored information to select a response to a request. Similar to Mehta, Larsson

teaches the use of information on a subscriber stored on a memory (Col. 4 lines 33-44) to provide a response to a subscriber. Little also fails to teach selecting a response to a call based on a service dialed number selected to address the call and instead teaches locating providers of goods and services using wireless networks and providing a voice activated response, and fails to indicate how such a response is selected. Thornton teaches selecting a response to a wireless consumer based on a selection of a shopping option by the wireless consumer from a menu.

As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to teach or render obvious each of the elements of independent claim 1 for at least the reasons advanced above. The Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2 – 11 depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 1. Because the cited references do not anticipate claim 1, as discussed above, the cited references do not anticipate claims 2 – 11 for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Regarding independent claims 12, 23, and 27, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or render obvious claims 12, 23, and 27 for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 13 – 22, 24 – 26, and 28 – 33 depend upon independent claims 12, 23, and 27, respectively, and thus are also not taught or rendered obvious by the cited references. Claims 1 – 33 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims have overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration for the application and allowance of the pending claims.